

HUMAN EVENTS

Vol. XIII, No. 25

Saturday, June 23, 1956

Washington, D. C.

News Section

Printed in Two Sections

Operation X: This phrase — which does not, in fact, refer at all to the President's surgery — has started to go the rounds in the White House offices and corridors. "Operation X" actually signifies a plan, only recently and very secretly decided upon, to dispose of Nixon as Vice Presidential candidate and to replace him with a substitute whose popularity with the Palace Guard, at least, is certainly 100 per cent.

(It should be explained that the Guard — despite a strong popular assumption to the contrary — has never ceased to seek ways and means to replace Nixon. Even that usually wary Californian has apparently been lulled into a false sense of security.)

The center of the cabal actually is in New York, where part of the time (part of the time in Washington) sits Mr. Sidney Weinberg, New Deal Eisenhower Republican and a power in the political setup of the Administration. Weinberg's position in the eyes of those in the know has, indeed, increased so greatly that one hears revival of another phrase, familiar in Rooseveltian days, "Clear it with Sidney."

It is claimed that Weinberg, by a brilliant display of logic, eliminated the usual names suggested by the Palace Guard for replacing Nixon, as follows: (1) Stassen, already knocked out by attacks of right-wing columnists; Hoffman, ditto; Milton Eisenhower, he had his boomlet last winter and the politicos shunned it — he's out; Herter, "the light that failed" (two months ago his boom collapsed).

But, argued Weinberg, one man could be built up in coming weeks sufficiently to prove acceptable to the convention. That man is Sherman Adams, "Assistant President." Adams, so runs the Weinberg dialectic, is best fitted because he understands, better than Nixon even, what the President wants, and even better than the Vice President, the machinery of Government to implement that Eisen-

hower policy. Even the bitterest enemies of Adams would find it difficult to combat this argument.

The plan is based to a certain extent on the expectation that the Chotiner affair (aired by the Democrats on Capitol Hill, and encouraged by anti-Nixon GOP insiders in the Executive branch) will receive a new batch of evidence in coming weeks. Correspondingly, Nixon's stock will descend. Then, synchronized with this envelopment, the talent of Adams as the "great Administrator" will be built up with the aid of the usual obliging correspondents and columnists. (Such scribes are usually "bought" by giving them news breaks — then they collaborate.) The final phase will begin at the GOP convention when the Oklahoma delegation (reported in HUMAN EVENTS on June 9, as containing a group of "anti-Nixon" people) will first unfurl the banner of Sherman Adams as Vice-Presidential candidate. Then, the bandwagon is supposed to start to roll.

President's Health: Among prominent Republicans, much less confidence is expressed privately that Ike will be well enough to run. This coincides with the feeling that the President's physicians have not been completely candid about his condition. Thus, it is believed that his doctors knew about his ileitis for many months before the attack which resulted in surgery, but did not mention it publicly. Among physicians in the Capital (who, true enough, have not been consulted on Ike's maladies) there is some wonderment about many reports for many years that the President has suffered from chronic high blood pressure. There seems no evidence of this in the official health reports on the President. What's the truth?

● Big question among political dopesters: is the New Dealers' barrage on the subject of the President's health having an effect on the public which will be adverse to Ike's chances in the election? No answer as yet. But, it is suggested that

the barrage is well directed by a secret "liberal" apparatus which must have some reason to think that it's making an impression on the public. (That apparatus, those who are familiar with it say, usually knows what it is doing.) Press observers believe that a central research bureau is operating, to gather data and arguments and to feed them to the liberal columnists and commentators. (The various medical facts and opinions utilized by this and that columnist the past week illustrate the thoroughness of this propaganda machine.) That's the way it looks to professionals who have long watched activities of the apparatus during the New and Fair Deals.

● The spectacle of New Deal columnists now addressing "tongue-in-cheek" appeals to the President not to run, on account of his health, recalls to the editor of HUMAN EVENTS how these gentry in 1944 chided this publication for running comments on Franklin D. Roosevelt's health in the campaign of that year.

● There's some cruel jesting among calloused observers, inspired by the irrepressible optimism of the President's physicians. Such as "Ike will be a shoo-in for election if he gets cancer," and "All he needs now is a stroke and he'll live forever."

Truman Scandals: When a Federal jury on June 14 convicted two top Truman Administration officials, T. Lamar Caudle and Matthew J. Connally, of conspiring to help an income tax evader, the news inspired a caustic review of the "Truman scandals" from Senator John J. Williams (R., Del.) on the floor of the Senate. Williams, who himself between 1950 and 1952 did much to uncover corruption in the Internal Revenue Bureau, recited some of the features of that deplorable era. Williams first of all placed in the *Congressional Record* a copy of the HUMAN EVENTS piece of April 21, by Jules Abels, which was a chapter from that writer's book *The Truman Scandals* (of which some 15,000 copies have been sold). Abels contrasted the magnitude of the scandals under Truman with those under the Harding Administration in the '20's. "The civil recovery in Teapot Dome amounted to \$13 million. The amount lost through the wholesale tax frauds alone of the Truman Administration must have run into the billions."

Senator Williams recalled that between 1950 and 1954 there were indictments of 214 corrupt officials of the Treasury Department. "Eighty-eight," he said, "had been indicted for accepting bribes for fixing tax cases." The Delaware legislator further reminded his colleagues that, of the five top officials of the tax collecting service of the Treasury, three were sent to the penitentiary and the other two resigned for reasons of health after the exposures started. Williams also brought out that the Democratic Administration in 1948 allowed large contributions to the Democratic party funds to write off the amounts as normal business expenditures. "They collected over a half a million dollars in this crooked manner," said Williams. Senator Mundt (R., S.D.) interrupted to praise Williams' review of the matter and to point out how free from corruption has been the Federal Administration since 1953.

In the Senate cloakrooms, it was remarked that President Truman (now travelling in Europe) has made no comment on the conviction of his aides, Connally and Caudle. If the former President should soon say something in their defense, it would impair his influence in the coming Democratic convention to elect a Presidential nominee. Such was the verdict of those Senators discussing the matter. Truman, it is obvious, wants very much to be the "kingmaker" in that convention.

Air Power: "I am astonished that right-wing Republicans now oppose the voting of \$1.1 billion more funds for the Air Force to speed production of B-52 long-range intercontinental bombers," said General Bonner Fellers, today. Fellers for five years was the consultant on defense matters of the Republican National Committee. For years, Taft and Hoover fought for the air concept of national defense and enjoyed the support of these conservative Members of Congress in this policy. Now they oppose this measure which, I am sure, Taft would heartily support if he were alive." The vote was in the Senate Appropriations Committee on January 19, and ten Democrats were joined by three Republicans for the increase which passed in Committee. Nine Republicans opposed it. Many Senators favor reducing foreign aid and increasing production of long-range bombers.

Not Merely Gossip: A legislative maneuver is under way to undermine — with the help of prominent Republican Senators — the basic immigration law of the land, the McCarran-Walter Act. This law had, and apparently still has, the support of the overwhelming majority of the American people, but is opposed by various minority groups, including the Communists (whose organ the *Daily Worker* carries on a continuous assault on this law and constantly urges its amendment). The new maneuver is designed to tack onto a special bill a rider which would, among other things (1) transfer all unused immigration quotas from Northern and Western European countries to Southern and Eastern countries and (2) would break down procedures in security cases, thus opening the way for entrance of Communists into the U.S.

All the minority groups, to which such members as Senator Lehman of New York normally cater, have reportedly been alerted and are putting pressure on Members of Congress, who are up for election this year and who would prefer not to draw the fire of such groups. Among the latter is Senator Everett Dirksen of Illinois, who faces a difficult fight for retention of his seat. Also, reportedly, the White House Palace Guard, playing hand in glove with the lobbyists of these groups, has worked on Senator Watkins (R., Utah) to push the rider which would cripple the Immigration Act. Watkins has shown himself a pliable Senator when the Guard goes to work on Congress; the Utah man followed the strategy laid down by the Palace Guard in their successful efforts to get Republican Senator Joseph McCarthy censured.

UN Delegation: The State Department (or perhaps the issue is of sufficient importance to make it the White House) is experiencing considerable difficulty, and some embarrassment, in trying to select a non-governmental Democratic member of the United States' delegation to the United Nations General Assembly session which convenes in New York on November 12.

The difficulty stems from what appears to be a belief on the Administration's part that he should come from the ultra-liberal wing of the Democratic party, and therefore be "soft" on the question of admitting Communist China to the UN. That problem undoubtedly will be one of the first and foremost issues to arise during the Assembly meet-

ing, originally scheduled for September, but pushed up so that it will come after our general elections.

The first name tentatively offered to Senate leaders was that of Dean Rusk, Assistant Secretary of State under the Truman-Acheson regime. The immediate protests from GOP Senators were so violent that the name was hastily withdrawn.

Next came the name of Boston's Federal Judge Charles E. Wyzanski, Jr., who has been severely criticized by many, including radio commentator Fulton Lewis, Jr., for his kid-glove treatment of Communist and dope cases brought into his Court. Senatorial breaths were being drawn for equally-loud protests when Wyzanski took himself out of consideration, on the grounds that his judicial idols made a practice of refusing non-judicial assignments, in the interest of maintaining their impartiality, and he felt he should, too. Wyzanski, in the 30's was a New Deal governmental attorney of the "liberal" suasion.

Presently under consideration is a New York attorney, Edward S. Greenbaum, a 40-year law partner of veteran liberal Morris Ernst. If Greenbaum has any particular leftist views, he has kept them out of the public eye; thus far, Senate leaders know little or nothing about him and on that basis he may be accepted.

The White House has chosen as Republican non-governmental member of the delegation, Paul Gray Hoffman, Marshall Plan Administrator under President Truman, Board Chairman of the notorious Fund for the Republic, Board Chairman of the ailing Studebaker-Packard Corporation, and intimate of President Eisenhower. His name, too, is provoking ardent Senatorial opposition but thus far the White House is adamant, saying it has counted noses and finds that Hoffman will be confirmed.

Labor Front: The AFL-CIO Executive Council recently set up an Ethical Practices Committee, under the chairmanship of the widely-respected president of the Machinists Union, Al Hayes, to investigate cases involving alleged racketeering or mishandling of union monies. It then is to submit recommendations for disciplinary action, or against it, to the Executive Council.

Several cases already have been turned over to the Committee. But New York District Attorney

Frank S. Hogan this week presents it with what amounts to a direct challenge, to demonstrate its sincerity by prompt action in a case in which the facts already have been brought out by Hogan in a Grand Jury investigation.

That probe now has resulted in an indictment against Sol Cilento, former secretary-treasurer of the Distillery, Rectifying, Wine and Allied Workers International Union of America. He is accused by the Grand Jury of siphoning off \$16,125 of union funds, by keeping on its payroll a woman described as an attractive blonde and a very close friend of Cilento. Hogan says the Grand Jury probe developed that during her four and one-half years on the payroll, the blonde showed up at union offices only twice, both times for Christmas parties.

Hogan also says there is a shortage in union funds which apparently will reach about \$100,000. The jury, he says, was unable to determine the exact amount because the union's president, Joseph C. O'Neill, has very carefully kept the union's books and records away from his jurisdiction. O'Neill, found by newsmen in Florida, tells them he is keeping himself away from Hogan's clutches, too.

Hogan, in what amounts to a "put up or shut up" statement, says O'Neill has evinced "outrageous defiance of everything laid down as fundamental" by AFL-CIO president George Meany on the subject of ethics of the labor union movement.

Letter from ANDREW F. SCHOEPPPEL, U.S. Senator from Kansas: "I genuinely appreciate the matters covered and the views expressed in your publication. It is a boiled-down digest of important happenings in our country, clearly expressed, without fear of consequences. Keep up the good work!"

Atlantic Union: Proponents of so-called "Atlantic Union," a form of one-worldism which would embrace nations bordering on or close to the Atlantic Ocean (starting with the North Atlantic but ultimately working southward), are hailing the Administration's move to strengthen NATO — the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

Freedom and Union is the name of the movement's monthly magazine, edited by Clarence K.

Streit, former newsman and long-time one-worlder who admits his proposed Atlantic Union government would perforce take over some phases of the sovereignty of member nations.

Says an editorial in its June issue: "At long last, the U.S. Government has committed itself to explore stronger unification of the North Atlantic Community. It did this by four important moves in quick succession, though none — at this writing — went to the point of calling for action on the resolution for an Atlantic Exploratory Convention, pending in Congress."

Its four cited developments were: 1. Secretary Dulles' April 23 speech saying that if NATO members wish to discuss strengthening the NATO setup politically, "the U.S. will join eagerly in exploring" the subject.

2. The Paris May 5-6 meeting of the NATO Council and its decision to set up a committee of three to discuss NATO political ties.

3. President Eisenhower's May 9 letter to Senator Walter George asking him to serve "as my personal representative and special Ambassador in the development of this new evolutionary step within the North Atlantic Community."

4. What it reports as the President's decision to put greater reliance on medium-range bombers in national defense planning; this decision, it says, is based on the assumption of adequate bases for these aircraft in "Atlantic Community" nations (particularly in Western Europe), more closely tied together, politically.

Washington fears Mr. Streit may have a better conception of long-range Administration plans than do Congressional leaders who accept the Eisenhower-Dulles statements at their face value.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTION to HUMAN EVENTS for new subscribers only: 6 weeks for \$1.
Yearly rate, \$10; 6 months, \$6; 3 months, \$3.
By first class mail, \$12 a year; by airmail (including APO and FPO) \$14 a year. FOREIGN: by regular mail, \$13 a year; airmail, \$18.
Allow us 2 weeks to process new subscriptions and changes of address.
1955 Bound Annual Volume with complete Index \$15. All Bound Volumes for years prior to 1955 have been sold.
The Declaration of Independence opens: "When in the course of HUMAN EVENTS . . ."

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor and Publisher*

Contributing Editors: FRANK CHODOROV, WILLIS J. BALLINGER

JAMES L. WICK, *Executive Publisher*

HUMAN EVENTS, 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C., is a weekly newsletter reporting from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. Published usually in two sections: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article section. Entered as second class matter at Washington, D. C. Copyright 1956.

Article Section

ORDEAL BY LIBERALISM

Debate At Ripon

By E. MERRILL ROOT

THE DOMINANT prejudice or ignorance in American colleges today is that conservatism is "spun of a tangled yarn" (see *The Amherst Student*), and that it represents a quaint obscure philosophy which modern students cannot condone or even understand. Since this is so, some understanding of conservative philosophy must somehow, somewhere, be taught, or our Constitutional Republic, free enterprise, and individualism, will die by the pernicious anemia of default. That dour fact, known to all realistic minds today, is illuminated as by the glare of a spotlight by what happened at Ripon College, Wisconsin, in 1955.

Ripon, an excellent small liberal arts college, is an educational ornament of the birthplace of the Republican Party. It had, in 1955, just elected a new president (only 34) — Dr. Fred O. Pinkham — a war veteran who had lost a leg in action, a Baptist, and a man who by theory and conviction is a conservative. The dominant liberals of Ripon seem to have known he was a conservative when inaugurated, for they said (*The Ripon College Days*, February 28, 1956) that his inaugural address was "loaded with the emotive terms and clichés that serve to demonstrate muddled thinking on the part of this Administration." Translated out of liberal jargon, this means that the article accuses President Pinkham of the contemporary crime of being a conservative.

Dr. Pinkham himself is able, sincere, finely motivated. He is almost too finely idealistic, one judges, to be tough enough for the terrible war of two worlds which fractures society today into two uncompromising camps. Therefore, under crisis, he proved naive about collectivist extremity and soft under the blitzkrieg of the liberal panzers. Too early in his presidential career, he suffered ordeal by liberalism, and acted too much as a gentleman among the men who are clear-minded and ruthless, and not always gentlemen.

In the summer of 1955, the Republican Educational Foundation (now more aptly named the Foundation for American Principles and Traditions), tentatively selected Ripon as a focal point for the initiation of a study of the neglected bases of the American Republic and the forgotten or forbidden study of conservatism.* Wishing to set up summer seminars of conservative studies, it selected Ripon as a natural center for such an open and objective program. Its proposal was simply that the Foundation sponsor and finance this summer session, merely using the facilities of Ripon College as a dignified home for this legitimately cultural study.

The Foundation had a tentative promise of \$30,000 from another Foundation to supplement its own finances, provided that the gifted author and eminent educator, Dr. Russell Kirk, should head the project. Both Foundations wished to do this in a free, objective, scholarly way; their stated purpose and constant practice was to study the facts and discover the truth. The Foundation for American Principles and Traditions thus stated the purpose of the school of conservative studies: "In a short time this research center should become a national 'clearing house' of information, reinforcing the conservative impulses of a great part of our nation with accurate information and objective study — *with facts, not propaganda.*" (Italics added.) That the bases of one of the great impulses in human nature — man's dynamic to sift the good and to preserve the best, which is conservatism — should receive its share of attention, is surely neither wicked nor foolish. And with the gracious integrity and wise insight of Dr. Russell Kirk to guide it, the seminar would have been as eminently fair as uniquely illuminating. It would have been what educators pretend to seek:

*This present study was not initiated by any interested party, but is solely an objective individual criticism of all parties. The Foundations involved had no part in its fashioning except that they courteously provided documentary information when asked.

a bold departure into the new, a fearless exploration of what is today the forbidden faith.

This seminar, moreover, was to function in the summer only. It would thus in no way have forced conservative doctrine upon the regular students of Ripon or challenged the liberals on the faculty. Also, its openly stated purpose to study conservatism constructively was frank and free, whereas conferences of collectivists do *not* openly state their true purpose and *do* study only one side. Thus at Middlebury College (March 19-20, 1954) there was a conference on "National Security vs. Individual Freedom," at which only collectivists spoke and at which only liberal opinion was voiced. But no academic exposition greeted it as "one-sided."

THE FOUNDATION approached President Pinkham with its plan. Dr. Pinkham, on his own initiative, suggested that Ripon College itself sponsor it, and make Dr. Kirk a formal member of the Ripon faculty. Ripon was to request the second Foundation to make its grant, place Dr. Kirk upon the staff, and establish a summer School of Conservative Studies. Under the drive of President Pinkham's enthusiasm, arrangements were made to petition for the grant, by long distance telephone conversations with Mr. Norris J. Nelson, of the Foundation for American Principles and Traditions. Dr. Pinkham made a special trip East to request in person the grant from the second Foundation. Preliminary arrangements were approved by both parties. Dr. Pinkham presented this to the working committee of the Board of Trustees; they approved it. From that point on, all discussions were between such academic figures as Dr. Pinkham for the college and Dr. Kirk for the School of Conservative Studies. Both Foundations meticulously avoided any dabbling in the details or direction of the studies, which were to be jointly determined by Dr. Pinkham and Dr. Kirk, both intellectuals, both eminent academicians, both minds of high integrity.

Not only President Pinkham, but also Mr. Sam F. Pickard, President of the Board of Trustees, were in favor of the proposed School of Conservative Studies. They both "repeatedly" told Mr. Nelson that the School of Conservative Studies would "never be defeated." They believed in it while the going was easy; but when they ran into aggressive opposition, they capitulated—not out of conviction, but under pressure. They did so in the honest belief that it was for the good of Ripon; but they forgot that the mind's first allegiance must be not to expediency but to truth.

President Pinkham, uneasily sensing dissent, made the strategic mistake of calling a too early faculty

meeting. Without preparing for the naively unsuspected blasts of liberal fury, he told his plan to the faculty. As reported in an editorial in the *Madison Capital Times* (October 25, 1955), "The majority reaction of the faculty . . . was that the conservative institute project could not be tolerated on a liberal arts campus, because it would tend to emphasize one political-social view over all others and would tend to drive liberals off the campus." As the liberals on the faculty, the same editorial boasts, outnumbered the conservatives *over three to one*, they would have required a lot of driving! And since one "political-social" view was *already* represented by a proportion of over three to one, might not conservatism also have been given a voice? But, through the aid of the *Capital Times* abroad and *The Ripon College Days* at home, the liberals struck, and struck hard.

The intrusion of the *Capital Times* reveals a strange fact. Such faculty meetings were supposed to concern the college only, until official releases were made to the press; here no official releases were made. Yet immediately after the meeting, the *Capital Times* knew all that had taken place in intimate detail, and muddled the waters with its own weird semantics of the Left. The only explanation must be that there was a leak, by liberal members of the faculty, of the fact of the closed meeting and of confidential information as to what occurred there.

The liberals within Ripon used the publicity in the *Capital Times* (which they themselves must have provided) as a rallying cry on the campus. *The Ripon College Days* (November 8, 1955) published a letter to the editor which described Ripon as "ripe for the plucking" (by big business). It charged that Ripon had "long been known as an institution controlled by and dedicated to the aims of the big business interests who support it with contributions." It attacked Dr. Kirk: "Kirk [sic] is the author of much reactionary literature." It charged Dr. Kirk with opposing "what he calls 'democratic despotism.'" It concluded: "Here is a good, clinical study of how far big business interests will go to control education, once they sit in unchallenged control of a school."

The *liberals* so sat "in unchallenged control" of Ripon that, in the college paper, only one side was given a voice. Thus the paper (November 15, 1955) tells of the developing fray: "The petitions against the plan were signed by 351 members of the student body and stated that the signers opposed a connection between Ripon College and any one viewpoint. [This means, of course, any *conservative* viewpoint: the liberal point of view was already there.] The signers numbered about

70 per cent of the entire student body." If 70 per cent of the entire student body favored liberal collectivism, surely "one social-political view over all others" was *already* in the saddle, riding the mind; and it was time for a new and needed corrective. "Kirk," the paper declared, "is a highly controversial figure in the field of conservative thought." The paper feared that "it might be necessary to maintain a research laboratory on the campus during the whole school year." Caliban, long ago, advised the burning or banning of Prospero's books; and the liberals advocated now such a banning of a conservative arsenal of the mind. They were rightly afraid of a library of conservatism.

In the same issue, Dr. Robert G. Olson (Assistant Professor of Philosophy) opposed the school in the "Letters to the Editor" column. He wrote: "The announced director of the institute and one of the originators of the plan is Dr. Russell Kirk. Dr. Kirk is a highly controversial figure whose writings have been attacked in many scholarly journals. In the highly respectable *Journal of Philosophy*, for instance, a well-known scholar [name him, professor!] accused Kirk of committing himself to 'patent historical absurdities' and of 'displacing argument with rhetorical bombast.' An inspection of Kirk's works will, I believe, convince the impartial reader of the truth of this criticism." Such innuendo and baseless charges without evidence were broadcast from the pages of the paper again and again.

THE *Ripon College Days* gloated editorially over the fact that "the Ripon faculty voted 31 to 10 against the establishment of a conservative institute." (November 8, 1955.) This the paper upheld; it charged that to study conservatism would make Ripon "cease to be a healthy college." It declared that, if conservatism were studied, "the degree of Ripon College would be seriously cheapened." It concluded: "The finest traditions of 100 years are imperilled. Let us not stand idly by."

The paper continued this bigotry in the issue of November 15, 1955. Its lead article said: "The proposed establishment of a conservative institute at Ripon had remained cloaked in vagueness until released to the public in an article and editorial printed in the Madison *Capital Times* two weeks ago. Since the plan was made public, the student body and some newspapers have expressed their extreme disapproval." The article said: "It is generally felt among the students that the purpose of a liberal arts school is to explore all viewpoints and that this purpose would be defeated by the establishment of an institute of conservatism here." (What kind of logic had Professor Olson been teaching the boys?) In this issue, there were *two* editorials and

both opposed the study of conservatism. Both flatly stated that to study conservatism would be a denial of academic freedom. They wistfully opined that, if the project were just dropped quietly into a deep hole, all "bad publicity would end." But, bad publicity or not, they were resolved that Ripon students shall know no more about conservatism than Victorian girls were supposed to know about a bordello. To know anything about conservatism would "change the character of Ripon College in an unhealthy way."

This attack seems to have taken President Pinkham and Trustee Sam Pickard by surprise. President Pinkham called a "convocation" at which, for twenty minutes, he tried to explain and defend his program; he was so unprepared for the tough boys of liberalism, however, that both he and Mr. Pickard (four sources declare) "had a very rough time of it." Instead of explaining the plan with firm logic, then supporting it firmly with the authority that was theirs, they were beaten down by what after all, in Virgil's phrase was "*vox, et praeterea nihil*." They promised that "nothing would be done that would hurt Ripon College"; that they would not "do anything contrary to the wishes of the student body and faculty." They had the power to enforce the clear decision they had made and publicly stated; but, as President Pinkham put it, they did not "think the School of Conservative Studies is going to be continued over the protests of the faculty and student body."

Thus the plan that President Pinkham and Trustee Pickard had said would "never be defeated" was dropped "like a hot potato." The *Chicago Tribune* published some ironic articles on the debacle; President Pinkham tried to blame the defeat on these. Actually, three days before the *Tribune* broke the story open, President Pinkham, meeting with Dr. Kirk and Mr. Regnery in Chicago, asked them to drop the plan as Ripon would no longer sponsor it. Dr. Pinkham told the Board of Trustees of Ripon (January 19, 1956) that the proposal was dead because the sponsoring Foundation had withdrawn its offer of financial support. A phone call to the officials, I am informed by Mr. Nelson, elicited the answer that this was not so.

But in the face of such arrogant prejudice and such abject capitulation, what hope was there of establishing a free, objective, scholarly School of Conservative Studies? The study of conservatism means that the good must be patiently sifted and the best must be nobly conserved. No such school as had been the dream of its founders was now possible. Ripon had showed itself as yet unready for the sweetness and light that conservatism demands. Dr. Kirk told the Foundation that the success of a

true school of conservatism at Ripon was impossible, or at least too questionable to be pushed.

That a School of Conservative Studies was *needed* at Ripon College is proved by the issue of *The Ripon College Days* for January 31, 1956. When the study of conservatism had been finally purged from Ripon, the liberals broke out into a literally ribald joy. In the college paper of that date, the heading, splashed across the first page, reads: "GOOD GUYS SMASH BAD GUYS AND WIN." The subheading is: "LIBERALS SAY PHOOEY TO OPPOSITIONS." Supposedly the articles were satire; actually they were a thinly disguised gloating over the purge of conservatism. My correspondent would not send me this issue through the mail, but only by express, because the issue was literally obscene.

I will not quote a word of the issue, but I have photostatic copies and can prove the fact that it was obscene. Conservatives on the Board of Trustees, and Dr. Russell Kirk, were grossly satirized by juggling their names into idiotic perversions. The whole issue was a proof of what the thing that is today called "liberalism" is when it stands dominant, uncriticized, arrogant, and when it carries the logic of its premises to their incredible conclusion. The article was, also, not only a *reductio ad absurdum* of the liberal claim to be liberal, but also a clear demonstration of the desperate need of contemporary colleges to have a center of conservatism, so that they may stand as islands of light above the dark tides of arrogance and vulgarity that debase the modern world.

CERTAIN clear facts emerge from this debacle, sure beyond all dispute.

First, the so-called liberal spirit dominated this small, church-related, liberal arts college, over three-to-one. But, secure yet frightened, these liberals refused to allow conservatism a platform and a voice, and were politically deft enough to frighten and stymie a conservative administration that, in the face of their fury, reversed its own clear and wise decision. This triumph of the liberals led to as incredible and low a piece of journalism as has ever occurred in any college paper I have ever known. No true liberals can rejoice in such gloating as the headline: "GOOD GUYS SMASH BAD GUYS AND WIN."

President Pinkham was wise and firm in his public rebuttal of this issue of *The Ripon College Days*. He expelled the editors responsible and he has since insisted that the paper shall be more amenable to the graces of civilized debate. But he does not

seem, even yet, to realize that what finally happened was simply the toxic flower of roots that are still firmly set in the soil of his college. He is like the optimist who cuts down a lush growth of poison ivy, but who still leaves the tough roots unharmed in the ground.

I have great sympathy and high regard for President Pinkham. I know he was and is in a tough spot; I know that the forces arrayed against him, strong in all our colleges with three decades of uncriticized arrogance, were and are terrific. But I believe that a college president who will save the small, church-related, liberal arts college, must be politically sophisticated, firm and realistic, and (in Nietzsche's sense) "hard." He must not carry around the umbrella that went to Munich; he must scorn "appeasement"; he must not expect "peace in our time." He must *fight*.

I believe that the president of the small college today is in the most strategic position in education. But he must regard himself as one of our expendables, and live by or die for *principle* and not expediency. He must be willing to live dangerously. He must make his motto the words of Ibsen: "The strongest man in the world is he who stands most alone." And he must see to it that the conservatism in which he says he believes has a hearing even in today's world of dominant liberals who call "academic freedom" their own selfish isolationism at the one microphone available.

Ripon College had an opportunity to be the first small college to reverse the conventions and clichés of the day, to become unique, to dare to give the forbidden faith of conservatism a place in the light once more. It failed to do so. I do not wish, myself, to assess the blame: I only feel the tragedy.

Additional copies of this 4-page Article: single copy 20¢ (coins, not stamps); 10 copies \$1; 25 copies \$2; 100 copies \$5; 500 copies \$20; 1,000 copies \$30. In 5,000 lots \$20 per thousand.

E. Merrill Root is Professor of English at Earlham College, Richmond, Indiana, and the author of six books of poetry. He has contributed many articles to HUMAN EVENTS, and is the author of *Collectivism On The Campus*, published last fall.

HUMAN EVENTS was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. It is published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C., and reports from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It is usually published in two parts: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article. \$10 per year.

**TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS for new subscribers only:
6 weeks for \$1.**